UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,185	05/11/2001	Lois M. Delcambre	1264-001	7230

7590 06/18/2004	**EXAMINER**
IPSOLON LLP	TANG, KUO LIANG J
805 SW Broadway #2740	
Portland, OR 97205	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05/11/2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is

closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage

application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed on 5/11/2001.

The priority date for this application is 8/29/2000.

Claims 1-40 are pending and have been examined.

Specification

2.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract of the disclosure

exceeds 150 words in length and more than one paragraph. Correction is required. See

MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1-4, 6-18, 20-22, 24-28, 30-34, 36-37 and 39 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maier et al., "Superimposed information for the

Internet", ACM SIGMOD Workshop on The Web and Databases WebDB '99, pages 1-9,

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, June 3-4, 1999 (hereinafter Maier99).

As Per Claim 1, Maier99 teaches that While superimposed information is nothing

new. The huge volumes of on-line information demand alternative groupings and

organizations of information elements to make it usable and comprehensible by

individuals and special interest communities. The low cost with which information can be

placed on the Internet means that much of it is inaccurate or of questionable value,

creating the need for annotation and evaluations by others. Finally, emerging standards

such as RDF, XLink and Topic Navigation Maps will facilitate the creation and exchange

of superimposed information. (E.g. see Introduction and associated text). In that Maier99

discloses the method that covering the steps of:

"expressing the selected computer information (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2,

"Information Element" of DTD1 and associated text) in a uni-level description (E.g. see

page 7, Figure 2, "Entity Instance" and associated text) using basic structures (E.g. see

page 7, Figure 2, "Entity Type", "Releationship Type" and associated text) that represent

the selected computer information with reference to a generic set of abstractions

applicable to representation schemes having different model structures (E.g. see page 7,

Figure 2, DTD1, DTD2 and associated text);" and

"transforming the selected computer information expressed in the uni-level

description to the second representation scheme (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2, DTD2 and

associated text)."

As Per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Maier99

teaches:

"the basic structures include construct elements and structural connector elements

(E.g. see page 7, Figure 2, "Entity Type" and associated text), wherein the structural

connector elements connect construct elements (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2, "Releationship

Type" and associated text)."

As Per claim 3, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and further Maier99

teaches:

"the basic structures further include a lexical element that describes a model

construct with instances that contain primitive-value types." (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2,

"Facet Type" (e.g. Bio) and associated text) .

As Per claim 4, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and further Maier99

teaches:

"basic structures further include a conformance connector that specifies a schema-

instance relationship between constructs." (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2, "Relationship

Instance" and associated text).

As Per claim 6, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Maier99

teaches:

"characterizing portions of the selected computer information as model constructs

(E.g. page 6, line 17), schema data (E.g. page 6, line 14), or instance data (E.g. page 6,

line 14)." (E.g. page 5, Figure 1 and associated text).

As Per claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Maier99 teaches:

"the first and second model structures are the same." (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2, DTD1, DTD2 and associated text).

As Per claim 8, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Maier99 teaches:

"the first and second model structures are different." (E.g. see page 4, lines 40-43).

As Per claim 9, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Maier99 teaches:

"the first and second representation schemes are each one of ... a topic map model (E.g. see page 6, lines 32-33) , and ....".

As Per claim 10, Maier99 teaches:

"expressing the selected computer information (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2, "Information Element" of DTD1 and associated text) in a uni-level description using basic structures that include construct elements (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2, "Entity Type" and associated text) and structural connector elements that connect construct elements (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2, "Releationship Type" and associated text), the construct

elements and structural connector elements being applicable to representation schemes

having different model structures (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2, DTD1, DTD2 and associated

text);" and

"transforming the selected computer information expressed in the uni-level

description to the second representation scheme (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2, DTD2 and

associated text)."

As Per claim 11, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and further Maier99

teaches:

"the first model data of the first representation scheme (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2,

DTD1 and associated text) are transformed into the second model data of the second

representation scheme (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2, DTD2 and associated text)".

As Per claim 12, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and further Maier99

teaches:

"the model data of the first and second representation schemes are different."

(E.g. see page 4, lines 40-43).

As Per claim 13, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and further Maier99

teaches:

"the first schema data of the first representation scheme (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2, DTD1 and associated text) are transformed into the second schema data of the second representation scheme (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2, DTD2 and associated text)."

As Per claim 14, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and further Maier99 teaches:

"the first model data (E.g. page 6, lines 20-27) of the first representation scheme (E.g. see page 5, Figure 1, $Schema_1$ and associated text) are transformed into the second schema data of the second representation scheme (E.g. see page 5, Figure 1, $Schema_n$ and associated text)."

As Per claim 15, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and further Maier99 teaches:

"any of the first model data, first schema data, and first instance data are transformed into any of the second model data, second schema data, and second instance data." (E.g. see page 6, lines 20-27 and see page 5, Figure 1 and associated text).

As Per claim 16, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and further Maier99 teaches:

"any two or more of the first model data, first schema data, and first instance data are transformed into any of the second model data, second schema data, and second instance data." (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2 and associated text, e.g. see page 6, lines 34-42, Artist and Painting).

As Per claim 17, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and further Maier99 teaches:

"the basic structures further include a lexical element that describes a model construct with instances that contain primitive-value types." (E.g. see page 7, Figure 2 and associated text, e.g. see page 6, lines 34-42, which states "...The Artist entity type has a facet to reference information elements in the base layer that contain biographical information about the artist...").

As per Claims 18 and 20, the rejections of claim 10 are incorporated and are rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 4 and 9.

As Per Claim 21, is the computer-readable medium claim corresponding to the system claim 1 and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

As per Claim 22, the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 3.

As Per claim 24, the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated and further Maier99 teaches:

"the basic structures express all of the first model data, first schema data, and first instance data." (E.g. see page 5, Figure 1 and associated text).

As per Claims 25-26, the rejections of claim 21 are incorporated and are rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 4 and 9.

As Per Claim 27, is the computer-readable medium claim corresponding to the system claim 1 and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

As per Claims 28 and 30-31, the rejections of claim 27 are incorporated and are rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 2 and 7-8.

As Per Claim 32, is the computer-readable medium claim corresponding to the system claim 10 and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 10.

As per Claims 33-34, the rejections of claim 32 are incorporated and are rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 15-16.

As Per Claim 36, is the computer-readable medium claim corresponding to the system claim 1 and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

As per Claim 37, the rejection of claim 36 is incorporated and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 2.

As Per Claim 39, is the computer-readable medium claim corresponding to the system claim 10 and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 19, 23, 29, 35, 38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maier99 in view of Lassila et al., "Resource Description Framework

(RDF) Model and Syntax Specification", W3C Recommendation 22 February 1999, URL:http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-rdf-syntax (hereinafter Lassila99).

As Per Claim 5, Maier99 discloses "the basic structures of the uni-level description have plural generic elements, including construct elements and structural connector elements"(E.g. see as noted above of Claim 1) and Resource Description Framework (RDF) (E.g. E.g. see page 4, lines 19-22). Maier99 does not explicitly disclose forming triples to represent the uni-level description. However, Lassila99 in an analogous art teaches "forming triples (E.g. see page 26, lines 1-10 and Figure 11-12 and associated text) to represent the uni-level description". Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Lassila99in into the teaching of Maier99 to use RDF's 3 tuples (triples) to represent the uni-level description. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated so that the superimposed information may be expressed in a model (RDF) that is not used by any of the information sources in the base layer.

As per Claim 19, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 5.

As per Claim 23, the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 5.

As per Claim 29, the rejection of claim 27 is incorporated and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 5.

As per Claim 35, the rejection of claim 32 is incorporated and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 5.

As per Claim 38, the rejection of claim 36 is incorporated and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 5.

As per Claim 40, the rejection of claim 39 is incorporated and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 5.

Conclusion

4.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuo-Liang J Tang whose telephone number is 703-305-4866. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q Dam can be reached on 703-305-4552.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306.

Kuo-Liang J. Tang

Software Engineer Patent Examiner

**WEI Y. ZHEN
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER**